

# **Overview of Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation Assessments – Yorkshire & The Humber Region**

## **Final Report for Yorkshire & The Humber Regional Assembly**

**Philip Brown**

Salford Housing & Urban Studies Unit  
University of Salford

**Pat Niner**

Centre for Urban and Regional Studies  
University of Birmingham

March 2009



## **About the Authors**

Philip Brown is a Research Fellow and in the Salford Housing & Urban Studies Unit (SHUSU) at the University of Salford.

Pat Niner is an Honorary Senior Lecturer in the Centre for Urban and Regional Studies (CURS) at the University of Birmingham

The Salford Housing & Urban Studies Unit is a dedicated multi-disciplinary research and consultancy unit providing a range of services relating to housing and urban management to public- and private-sector clients. The Unit brings together researchers drawn from a range of disciplines including: social policy, housing management, urban geography, environmental management, psychology, social care and social work.

# Contents

|   | Page   |
|---|--------|
| 1. Introduction   | 5      |
| 2. The Regional Context   | 6      |
| 3. Yorkshire and Humber GTAAs   | 10     |
| 4. Regional Residential Requirements                                  | 29     |
| 5. Regional Transit Requirements                                      | 32     |
| 6. Qualitative Guidance on Site Requirements for Gypsies & Travellers | 34     |
| 7. Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Need                           | 36     |
| 8. Yorkshire and The Humber: The Region in context                    | 38     |
| 9. References   | 43     |
| <br>Appendix Table A1   | <br>44 |
| Appendix Table A2   | 45     |



# 1. Introduction

Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments (GTAAAs) have now been completed covering all parts of the Yorkshire and The Humber Region.<sup>1</sup> This note presents an overview of the process and the resulting patterns of requirements for additional residential and transit pitches for Gypsies and Travellers and plots for Travelling Showpeople. It has been produced by the Salford Housing & Urban Studies Unit (University of Salford) and the Centre for Urban and Regional Studies (University of Birmingham).

Section 2 looks at the report produced for the Assembly in 2006, *'Identifying Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation Needs in Yorkshire and The Humber'* by the Centre for Regional and Economic Social Research (CRESR) at Sheffield Hallam University. Section 2 provides an overview of the regional picture from the 2006 report and illustrates the regional context over the last 3 years since the publication of this report. Section 3 looks at the GTAAAs themselves, including comments on the approaches taken to assessing requirements and implications for robustness and reliability of findings. Section 4 describes and comments on the requirements assessed at regional, sub-regional and local authority levels. The final section looks very briefly at transit accommodation issues. 'Requirement' is used in this note to mean the number of additional pitches or plots to be provided in order to meet assessed 'need' for pitches/plots net of any estimated 'supply' during the relevant planning period.

The note concludes that the survey methods and the ways in which pitch requirements are calculated are sufficiently consistent and robust for the GTAA findings to be relied upon to give a regional picture of requirements. In summary, regional requirements are:

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Residential pitches for Gypsies and Travellers Years 1–5  | 639 |
| Residential pitches for Gypsies and Travellers Years 6–10 | 243 |
| Transient pitches for Gypsies and Travellers Years 1–5    | 64  |
| Plots/yards for Travelling Showpeople Years 1–5           | 172 |

These requirements have been adjusted from the requirements detailed in the GTAAAs in order to compare across time periods. This is detailed in Chapter 4 of the report.

Due to the more focused and in-depth analysis of need at sub-regional levels, these requirements are a significant increase on the pitch requirements identified by earlier work by the Centre for Regional and Economic Social Research (CRESR) at Sheffield Hallam University for the Regional Assembly.

---

<sup>1</sup> Not all the GTAAAs have been formally accepted in final form by their constituent authorities.

## 2. The Regional Context

### The CRESR Report

The Centre for Regional and Economic Social Research (CRESR) at Sheffield Hallam University was commissioned by the Yorkshire and Humber Regional Assembly to produce *'Identifying Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation Needs in Yorkshire and The Humber'* (Powell, 2006). The primary aim of the research was to develop a better regional understanding of the current and changing needs of Gypsies and Travellers, including an assessment of factors that may impact on meeting current and future accommodation needs. The research involved a literature review, a local authority survey, interviews with stakeholders and in-depth interviews and focus groups involving 58 Gypsies and Travellers identified to include a range of groups, locations and current accommodation. The emphasis is on qualitative need although there is an assessment of future site requirements drawing on secondary data. Need in pitches is estimated in Table 1.

Table 1: Regional and sub-regional accommodation requirements to 2010

| Sub-region    | Current unmet need | Future need to 2010 | Total need             |
|---------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| Humber        | 15                 | 19                  | 34                     |
| North Yorks   | 28                 | 29                  | 57                     |
| South Yorks   | 38                 | 40                  | 78                     |
| West Yorks    | 61                 | 25                  | 86                     |
| <b>Region</b> | <b>142</b>         | <b>115</b>          | <b>255<sup>2</sup></b> |

Current unmet need is estimated by taking the average number of caravans on unauthorised sites over 5 periods of the Caravan Count. This is divided by 1.7 to convert to pitches. Future need is calculated by applying a 3% p.a. growth rate to the 5-period average of total caravan numbers from the Count, again dividing by 1.7 to convert to pitches. The report notes that needs estimated in this way will not take account of overcrowding/doubling up on sites or the need to move to sites from housing.

Importantly, the report states that local GTAAs are expected to produce higher estimates of requirements when elements of need are more comprehensively assessed.

The main (and ongoing) strength of this report is the general information and understanding provided by the qualitative work with Gypsies and Travellers. This has continuing relevance as context for the GTAAs and regional policy. Particularly valuable insights are into:

---

<sup>2</sup> Figure amended to reflect the correct summation of the sub-regional requirements shown in the CRESR report.

- Travelling patterns and motivations for travelling. This illustrates the varieties of motives involved and suggests that there are no clear, simple travel routes.
- Local authority site conditions (internal and environmental). There are obviously severe problems with many social sites in the Region, which may be deterring demand for site places as well as providing poor standards for residents.
- Largely negative views of bricks and mortar housing, suggesting latent need for site places were they to become available or made more suitable for older people or those with health problems.
- Aspirations for family sites – reinforced by the relative unpopularity of social sites and housing. This focuses policy attention on removing planning and affordability constraints on private site provision.
- ‘Deflected demand’ – which occurs when Gypsies and Travellers would prefer to live in an area but cannot because of strict planning or enforcement constraints. In such circumstances they move to nearby more ‘welcoming’ areas, reinforcing concentrations. This is a particularly important point to bear in mind when taking a ‘strategic view’ of pitch allocations to local authorities. The report notes a need for pitches in all local authorities whether or not there is current provision.
- Diversity of need within the Gypsy and Traveller communities, including Travelling Showpeople. This suggests that a single type or location of site will not meet all needs, and underlines the need to involve the communities in provision plans.

Overall, this assessment of regional and sub-regional requirements provided a useful initial, minimum estimate of pitch requirements but should be superseded by completed sub-regional GTAAAs which also provide estimates at local authority level.

### **Progress since 2005**

The Yorkshire and Humber Assembly have monitored provision since the CRESR report. A Local Authority Audit revealed a regional pitch total, as at March 2008, of 509 pitches on local authority/Registered Social Landlord sites and 302 pitches on private sites.<sup>3</sup> In its Annual Monitoring Report, the Assembly compares the 2008 pitch total with an estimate of the number of pitches in 2005 on local authority/RSL sites (554) and the number of caravans recorded in the 2005 Caravan Count on private sites (342) and concludes that there has been a decrease in pitch supply of 85 pitches between 2005 and 2008.

---

<sup>3</sup> RSS AMR 2008 published February 2009.

It is possible to interpret these figures in a different manner:

- The Local Authority Audit pitch total for local authority/RSL sites excluded Barnsley which reported a total of 28 pitches in the July 2008 Caravan Count (Table 2). Adding this to the Audit figures gives a regional pitch total of 839 pitches (social and private).
- Comparing figures for caravans with those for pitches should be treated with caution as many Gypsy and Traveller families have more than one caravan on their pitch. It is common practice to divide the number of caravans by 1.7 to get an estimate of the number of pitches. This produces a private pitch estimate of 201 pitches for 2005, suggesting that there has been an increase of 101 private pitches between 2005 and 2008. This appears realistic since the Caravan Count reveals an increase from 343 caravans in 2005 to 519 in 2008 on private sites (in both years the January and July figures have been averaged).

Taking these amendments together means that the 2005 regional pitch total is estimated at 755, compared with the 2008 total of 839. Rather than decreasing, this suggests a regional increase of 84 pitches thanks to a growth in private provision. The CRESR report estimated pitch shortfall (see Table 1 above) was 255 pitches. Our estimates indicate that some progress has been made towards meeting this need, although probably not at a sufficiently rapid rate.

### **Gypsy and Traveller Sites Grant**

Gypsy and Traveller Sites Grant supports the refurbishment of existing sites and the provision of new pitches or sites by local authorities or RSLs. Figures published by Communities and Local Government<sup>4</sup> for grants awarded for sites in Yorkshire and Humber Region show:

|         |                                     |                      |
|---------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 2006/07 | £1,181,655 (6 authorities; 9 sites) | 6% of national total |
| 2007/08 | £1,866,599 (4 authorities; 4 sites) | 6% of national total |
| 2008/09 | £2,025,132 (6 authorities; 9 sites) | 9% of national total |

Assembly figures suggest that the majority of grant has been awarded for refurbishment of existing sites. In all, grants awarded in these years should support the creation of 6 additional pitches (in Doncaster, East Riding, North Lincolnshire, Barnsley and North Yorkshire (Seamer).

### **Planning considerations**

One of the objectives in the research brief was to appraise the success or otherwise of private planning applications in relation to the Travelling communities making their own provision, and to use this appraisal to inform the revisions of Policy H6, its explanatory text and any subsequent implementation plan for the policy. We agreed to examine the sub-regional

---

<sup>4</sup> See <http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/housing/xls/sitesgrantawards.xls>.



GTAA's for information on planning applications, but not to carry out any further original work.

In fact, very few of the GTAA's across the Region dealt with issues related to the land-use planning system and planning applications by Gypsies and Travellers. The exceptions are:

- Hull
- North and North East Lincolnshire
- West Yorkshire

**Hull:** reported that there had been no applications made for the development of Gypsy and Traveller sites and that the local authority did not expect any applications to be forthcoming.

**North and North East Lincolnshire:** reported that there was 1 application for a 10-pitch transit site in 2001 but the outcome was not recorded. There had been no other applications since 2001. The report comments that there were no applications from Travelling Showpeople. The report further notes that a retrospective application in West Lindsey (part of East Midlands Region) for 4 residential and 12 transit pitches was granted, then quashed through judicial review. A new application was submitted and there was no decision at the time of the report. The site involved directly adjoins Yorkshire and The Humber.

**West Yorkshire:** there was no specific mention of planning applications in the GTAA. Information on applications was presented relating to Kirklees only. This indicated that a total of 6 applications had been received involving 5 different locations. Three of these resulted in some form of approval. The GTAA comments further that the refusal of applications was generally due to inappropriate development in the Green Belt, highway safety issues and the transient nature of the site being detrimental to the amenity of nearby residents.

This analysis is obviously partial and does not allow us to draw conclusions helpful for the revision of Policy H6. It does draw attention to the importance of future monitoring of planning applications and decisions as an indication of policy implementation.

### 3. Yorkshire and The Humber GTAA's

Guidance on Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessments was issued in draft form by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister in February 2006 and in final form (by Communities and Local Government) in October 2007. This confirms that the responsibility to carry out GTAA's lies with local housing authorities, but advocates sub-regional studies. A joint approach to carrying out GTAA's was adopted in most of the areas across Yorkshire and The Humber with the exception of Hull City Council and the East Riding of Yorkshire who commissioned single authority GTAA's. Table 2 (overleaf) shows the authorities contributing to the GTAA's and identifies who carried out each study.

All the Yorkshire and The Humber GTAA's post-date the draft Guidance on Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessments and most were undertaken after the completion of GTAA's in other parts of England, and particularly in the more southerly regions. The consultants involved in GTAA's other than the South Yorkshire GTAA had all worked on studies elsewhere prior to producing the GTAA's within the Yorkshire and The Humber region.<sup>5</sup>

We have closely examined all 6 GTAA's and gone through a basic benchmarking process in line with Steps 1 and 2 of the approach proposed in the CLG report *Preparing Regional Spatial Strategy reviews on Gypsies and Travellers by regional planning bodies* (2007). **It is important to stress that this is a desk-based process which relies on the GTAA report and any associated survey instruments. It cannot validate the accuracy of basic information. For example, it can check whether need arising from unauthorised development has been included in a reasonable manner, but not whether the reported extent of unauthorised development is accurate.** Findings are reported first on survey methods used and second on the 'models' used to estimate requirements.

#### Survey Methods Used in GTAA's

All the GTAA's follow approaches which broadly comply with the CLG Guidance on carrying out assessments. They all involve:

- Some analysis of secondary information, particularly the twice yearly Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Count carried out by local authorities and published by CLG. Within the South Yorkshire GTAA the monthly Doncaster Caravan Count was also analysed. Such information is used to establish context and trends. All except the North Yorkshire and East Riding GTAA's draw on local authority records of unauthorised

---

<sup>5</sup> As Table 2 shows, both Pat Niner (CURS) and Philip Brown (SHUSU) have been involved in the production of GTAA's within the Region. Care was taken to avoid bias in the benchmarking process: Pat Niner benchmarked the GTAA's where there was no or only a very small involvement of CURS (Hull, North and North East Lincolnshire and West Yorkshire – where only the local authority information was collected and analysed) and Philip Brown benchmarked those where SHUSU had no involvement (South Yorkshire, North Yorkshire and the East Riding).

encampments. All except South Yorkshire, North Yorkshire and East Riding analyse information from the respective local authorities, for example on-site provision and social site management. All GTAAAs except Hull and North and North East Lincolnshire use data from schools and/or Traveller Education Services to differing degrees.

- Stakeholders such as local authority officers, Showmen's Guild and others who work with Gypsies, Travellers and Showpeople are included in most GTAAAs. Semi-structured interviews and/or focus groups with stakeholders were carried out in all GTAAAs apart from the East Riding.
- An interview survey with Gypsies, Travellers and Showpeople in all relevant types of accommodation was carried out in all GTAAAs in the Region.

Table 2: Summary of Yorkshire and The Humber GTAAAs

| <b>GTAA</b>                              | <b>Local authorities covered</b>   | <b>Lead consultant</b>   |
|--|--|--|
| <b>East Riding of Yorkshire</b>          | East Riding of Yorkshire   | Arc4   |
| <b>Hull</b>                              | Hull   | SHUSU (University of Salford)  |
| <b>North and North East Lincolnshire</b> | North Lincolnshire, North East Lincolnshire                                    | SHUSU (University of Salford)  |
| <b>North Yorkshire</b>                   | Craven, Hambleton, Ryedale, Scarborough, Selby, Richmondshire, York, Harrogate | Arc4   |
| <b>South Yorkshire</b>                   | Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham, Sheffield                                      | Northern Housing Consortium, Marion Horton Associates & Access Matrix                                  |
| <b>West Yorkshire</b>                    | Bradford, Calderdale, Kirklees, Wakefield, Leeds                               | CRESR (Sheffield Hallam University), SHUSU (University of Salford) and CURS (University of Birmingham) |

These interview surveys with Gypsies and Travellers provided the basic information on which assessments of requirements were made. Table 3 shows the sample sizes achieved and also notes who undertook the interviews. The use of community interviewers (CIs) – Gypsies and Travellers recruited and trained to carry out interviews – demonstrates the involvement of local communities in the process and was, in several instances, invaluable in accessing Gypsies and Travellers, for example housed Travellers in North and North East Lincolnshire and all Gypsies and Travellers in North Yorkshire and East Riding. Sample sizes achieved appear adequate for robust findings especially at the sub-regional level (sample numbers are very small in some instances at local authority level because of small populations). The samples achieved in North and South Yorkshire are unusually large for GTAAAs.

Table 3: Sample Size in GTAA Surveys

| GTAA                              | Gypsies & Travellers | Showpeople  | Interviewers                   |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| East Riding of Yorkshire          | 75                   | 2   | CIs                            |
| Hull                              | 55                   | 0   | CIs + SHUSU                    |
| North and North East Lincolnshire | 52                   | 5   | CIs + SHUSU                    |
| North Yorkshire                   | 241                  | 67  | CIs                            |
| South Yorkshire                   | 339                  | Included but as part of a stakeholder focus group | CIs + LA officers in Doncaster |
| West Yorkshire                    | 167                  | 29  | CIs + SHUSU                    |

All GTAAs used questionnaires which focussed mainly on household characteristics and on previous, current and future accommodation, and travelling. All also included other questions on employment, health, education, housing-related support services and harassment and discrimination. While the precise wording of questions differs, as does the format of the questionnaires, there is sufficient similarity between the core questions which contribute directly to the assessment of accommodation requirements to provide broadly comparable results.

**Overall, therefore, we conclude that the survey methods used are appropriate and sufficiently consistent to permit a picture of need to emerge at regional level.**

### Methods of Calculating Pitch Requirements

Survey information and secondary data are usually combined to calculate pitch requirements in some form of 'model' which identifies a number of components of future pitch need and supply. While similar factors are taken into account in most GTAAs, the precise methods used often vary. Tables 4 to 11 summarise how a number of significant factors have been dealt with in the Yorkshire and The Humber GTAAs. The factors are:

- estimating the base population
- overcrowding and family growth
- unauthorised development
- unauthorised encampments
- movement between sites and houses
- supply issues
- transient needs
- Travelling Showpeople

There are comments on emerging issues and consistency of approach at the foot of each table.

Table 4: Base Population

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>East Riding of Yorkshire</b>          |   |
|  | The base population on sites is taken from LA records on the number of pitches. There were no private sites in the area. The estimated population used in housing is unclear; the report states that Traveller Education were aware of 20–30 families living on private sites, unauthorised sites or housing. Survey findings relating to housed Gypsies and Travellers are used in their own right and are not grossed up to this estimated population.  |
| <b>Hull</b>                              |   |
|  | In Hull there are no private sites or unauthorised developments. Information on LA sites is taken from both LA records and the survey and the base is well established. There is much less information about the population in housing, with one reference to 50 families from TES. However, survey figures are not grossed to the base population for any element of need.   |
| <b>North and North East Lincolnshire</b> |   |
|  | In the Study Area there are no council sites or unauthorised developments (a development outside the area is included in the survey and needs of its residents are included). Information on authorised private sites is taken from both LA records and the survey, and the base is well established. There is much less information about the population in housing. A total housed population of 20 households is assumed (15 interviews) but the origin of this figure is not clear. All figures in the needs assessment are grossed to the appropriate estimated base population. |
| <b>North Yorkshire</b>                   |   |
|  | The base population on sites is taken from LA records on the number of LA and private pitches. The base population in housing relies on TES data to estimate the population, combined with a pupil to household ratio.  |
| <b>South Yorkshire</b>                   |   |
|  | The base population on sites is taken from records on numbers of LA and private pitches in the area according to the CLG count. The estimate for the housed population is TES data coupled with survey information and LA estimates. All figures in the pitch requirement are grossed up to the appropriate estimated base population.  |
| <b>West Yorkshire</b>                    |   |
|  | The base population is established for both sites and housing using a combination of information from LA and other stakeholders and community interviewer contacts. All survey findings are grossed up to the appropriate estimated base population in the calculation of requirements.   |

### **Comments**

While apparently a simple task, establishing the base population is sometimes one of the most difficult things to do given the generally poor information available about Gypsies and Travellers and their accommodation. It is important because survey answers are usually grossed up to the base in estimating requirements. Estimating the number of Gypsies and Travellers in housing is particularly difficult, especially in the private sector; therefore some GTAAAs rely on information provided by Traveller Education Services (TES) or estimate the population based on their survey responses.

All the GTAAAs appear to have taken similar approaches to estimating the sited population starting with lists of sites compiled from local records and local knowledge. The Caravan Count is used in North Yorkshire to establish the site population. Generally speaking, base information is likely to be more reliable for authorised than for unauthorised sites, and for social than for private sites.

All GTAA's attempt to estimate the housed population as well although through different means. Potential implications of this are discussed in Tables 5 and 8.

The way in which base populations have been estimated should not introduce significant inconsistencies between GTAA's. The estimates seem as comprehensive as reasonably possible. South Yorkshire is the exception here, where the housed base population seems very large. This estimate is based upon TES data which, as in other GTAA's, leads to very high population estimates relative to those of other GTAA's which use a different approach – this may be the case here.

Table 5: Overcrowding and Family Growth

| <b>East Riding of Yorkshire</b>          |   |
|--|---|
|  | Does not use survey findings for family growth but rather applies a 3% multiplier to the sited (not housed) population for the 2008–2015 period. Includes a separate estimate for concealed households in housing and on sites in the measure of current shortfall. Combining these elements potentially overstates requirements. Overcrowding is considered but incorporated into concealed households.  |
| <b>Hull</b>                              |   |
|  | Concealed/doubled-up households on LA sites included in the model by drawing on LA information on site overcrowding. There are 20 new households estimated for the 2006–2011 period on the basis of survey findings about people in sited household likely to want their own accommodation. This is not grossed to the total population. There is no estimate of household formation from the bricks and mortar population. Applies a 3% p.a. compound growth estimate for 2011–2016 and 2016–2021. Comments that this needs to be kept under review to see whether site provision stimulates movement from bricks and mortar. The survey finds 44% of people feel that they do not have enough space, which is mostly related to the size of pitches; this is not incorporated into the model.   |
| <b>North and North East Lincolnshire</b> |   |
|  | Family growth from sites and housing is treated separately. For sites the model takes unadjusted survey answers for household members likely to need their own accommodation in the next 5 years (8%). The survey showed no new households due to form in housing but applies a 5% nominal rate for household formation needing site provision on the grounds that the sample was relatively small. In both instances, survey findings are grossed to the estimated base population. Future family growth 2012–2016 estimated at 3% p.a. compound on current pitches + 2007–2012 requirements. Overcrowding is not considered as a separate element.  |
| <b>North Yorkshire</b>                   |   |
|  | Does not use survey findings for family growth but rather applies a 3% multiplier to the sited (not housed) population for the 2008–2015 period. Includes a separate estimate for concealed households in housing and on sites in the measure of current shortfall. Incorporates overcrowding within concealed households. Assumes all concealed households require site-based accommodation. There is some possible double counting between these elements which may lead to an overstatement of requirements.   |
| <b>South Yorkshire</b>                   |   |
|  | Concealed households are included from both sites and bricks and mortar. There is no separate information relating to doubling-up. Takes overcrowding based on the bedroom standard on sites but not in housing. Takes survey findings on these elements from each LA area and grosses this up to the sited population in each area. Family growth from existing households takes the survey findings from each LA area and grosses this up to the population in each area. Comments that adjustments have been made to ensure no double counting with concealed households. This provides demand for 1 year (2006–2007). Family growth for years 2008–2011 is based on a 4.5% p.a. growth rate. This rate is based on survey data on the level of additional households formed in the past. It is difficult to see how new households who have only just formed will form again in the next 4 years. In addition, there is a likely mathematical error in the calculations where the 2008–2011 household formation rate is applied to a combined pitch availability and pitch supply |

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
|                       | figure. The combination of these factors suggests that it is likely that requirements have been overstated.   |
| <b>West Yorkshire</b> |   |
|                       | Overcrowding is not considered as a separate element of need. The survey asked about household members who would need their own separate accommodation in the next 5 years. Respondents were also asked whether the new households would need site accommodation in the Study Area. Survey findings in proportional terms are applied, without adjustment, to the estimated base populations. New household formation from both sited and housed populations are included. A 3% p.a. compound family growth rate is applied after 2012. |

### **Comments**

This is obviously an important element in estimating need which reflects both demographic trends and existing accommodation and adequacy of space available to families.

Most of the approaches taken in Yorkshire and The Humber are broadly consistent and, for the most part, unlikely to involve double counting. South Yorkshire and North Yorkshire are the exceptions here, where it could be argued both have potentially double counted between family growth and concealed households/overcrowding. This is probably more of a significant issue in South Yorkshire given the size of the multiplier (4.5%) used in the sub-region.



Table 6: Unauthorised Development<sup>6</sup>

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>East Riding of Yorkshire</b>          |   |
|  | 100% of households are in need of authorised accommodation. Based on the survey findings as to the number of developments rather than LA records.   |
| <b>Hull</b>                              |   |
|  | N/A; there were no unauthorised developments in Hull at the time of the GTAA.   |
| <b>North and North East Lincolnshire</b> |   |
|  | Takes the unusual step, at the request of the Steering Group for the study, of including 10 households on an unauthorised development in a neighbouring authority on the grounds that they originated in the Study Area. This development was missed from the neighbouring LA's GTAA and so double counting is unlikely. It should be noted that the area of the development is Brigg and is intersected by two local authorities: North Lincolnshire and West Lindsey (involving different regions). 100% allowance is made for residents on this unauthorised development on the grounds that the occupiers were previously Study Area residents and want to remain in Brigg. |
| <b>North Yorkshire</b>                   |   |
|  | Based on local authority information about the number of pitches; all assumed to be in need.  |
| <b>South Yorkshire</b>                   |   |
|  | The number of pitches in need of accommodation is based on local knowledge and the July 2006 Caravan Count data (caravans divided by 1.5 to achieve a household figure). 100% of these are assumed to be in need of accommodation.  |
| <b>West Yorkshire</b>                    |   |
|  | Based on local authority information about the number of pitches; all assumed to be in need.  |

### **Comments**

The Yorkshire and The Humber GTAAs are consistent in their treatment of unauthorised development as leading directly to need for residential pitches. There are, however, some idiosyncrasies in particular in the North and North East Lincolnshire GTAA and people on an unauthorised development in a neighbouring, non-participating, authority are seen as in need of accommodation within the North Lincolnshire area. This is based on the premise that the residents of this development are all ex-North Lincolnshire residents and have moved to the neighbouring authority due to a lack of provision in North Lincolnshire. This situation is complicated by the neighbouring authority (West Lindsey) being located in the East Midlands region and the local area where the site is situated (Brigg) being bisected by the two local authorities. It is reasonable that the need from this site has been allocated to North Lincolnshire and it appears that double counting has not occurred.

The South Yorkshire GTAA assesses the size of unauthorised developments on the number of caravans in a July Caravan Count; this might understate need due to the potential for under-counting and travelling during the summer count.

<sup>6</sup> This is defined as accommodation sited on land which is privately owned but which has not received planning permission.

Table 7: Unauthorised Encampments<sup>7</sup>

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>East Riding of Yorkshire</b>          |   |
|  | The need figure is based on the number of households surveyed on encampments during the fieldwork and an assessment of which households were homeless. This is not grossed up to any recorded number of encampments. However, the low number of UE caravans in the Caravan Count suggests that this may not, in reality, be a problem.  |
| <b>Hull</b>                              |   |
|  | The need figure is based on those interviewee households who said they would like more stable accommodation. This is not grossed up to an estimate of the total number of unauthorised households, which may slightly understate need.  |
| <b>North and North East Lincolnshire</b> |   |
|  | The study uses LA records to estimate the number of encampments (reduced for repeat visits), their average size and the (survey) average number of caravans per family, to calculate the number of families involved in unauthorised encampment in a year. It then assumes that 75% want a residential pitch in the Study Area – which is rather lower than is indicated by the survey. This is significantly the largest element of need estimated. The relatively high estimate may be justified by the apparent significance of a few families moving around the Study Area.   |
| <b>North Yorkshire</b>                   |   |
|  | Uses those interviewed as the sample frame for need but it is not clear how reflective these are of previous years. The model incorporates 65% of unauthorised encampments who are described as 'homeless' and uses a proportion of these to identify residential pitch requirements (90% of these). There is no moderation of these figures. This suggests a possible overstatement of requirements but this is a small element in the requirements  |
| <b>South Yorkshire</b>                   |   |
|  | Local knowledge is combined with Caravan Count data to produce a need figure. Assumes 100% of households (using a 1.5 caravan to household ratio) to be in need of accommodation although there is a comment about type of sites (residential/transit) later in the report. It is not clear if transit needs are implied or incorporated into this requirement.   |
| <b>West Yorkshire</b>                    |   |
|  | The study uses LA records of unauthorised encampments and survey findings. It notes the proportion of interviewees on unauthorised encampments who want a residential pitch in the Study Area. This proportion (22%) is applied to the estimated number of encampments in a year (171) from LA records. The resulting figure (39) is seen to be unrealistically high given repeat encampments etc. The number of pitches resulting from the calculation is therefore halved and 20-pitch need is entered into the model. There may be justification for a reduction on these grounds, but logically, the base should be the number of families, not encampments. The average encampment size was 7 caravans, perhaps 4 families. The approach is not entirely logical and is inconsistent with practice in other GTAs. Other things being equal, it would seem likely to understate need. |

### Comments

It has become the convention in GTAs to take account of unauthorised encampments when estimating residential as well as transit needs. This is, however, a very problematic area where most, if not all, approaches are open to criticism. In particular, unauthorised

<sup>7</sup> This is defined as residing on public/private land without the owners permission and/or planning permission

encampment caused by Gypsies and Travellers moving through or around an area should, ideally, be treated as 'flow' – there will be different groups in future who will also have needs. But GTAAAs treat the element as a one-off need. This is done in all the Regional GTAAAs. There is also a potential for double counting transient groups as in need in more than one GTAA. There is no way of checking this. At present, there are no better methods for assessing need arising from this element.

North and North East Lincolnshire and West Yorkshire GTAAAs have used local authority records of encampments to estimate the number of families likely to be involved in encampments in a year and then applied an assumption on the proportion (on the basis of the survey or stakeholder advice or a combination of the two) likely to need residential accommodation in the Study Area. The remainder have either used the Caravan Count as a base or the number of respondents interviewed. There are issues at a local level with most of these approaches (e.g. North and North East Lincolnshire seems high yet reasonable in the circumstances).

Table 8: Movement between Sites and Houses

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>East Riding of Yorkshire</b>          |   |
|  | The movement to housing from sites equates to a 2 pitch per year turnover rate. Movement from housing is taken quite narrowly from concealed households only. Although this might not account for other reasons for moving from housing it seems unlikely to have a significant effect given the estimated small size of the housed population.   |
| <b>Hull</b>                              |   |
|  | This is considered on the basis of survey findings and assumed to produce a zero net movement.  |
| <b>North and North East Lincolnshire</b> |   |
|  | Gross flows are estimated using a combination of survey answers and assumptions based on professional judgement and experience from elsewhere. All figures are grossed to the estimated base population. The study assumes a nominal 5% movement from sites to housing (survey answers are thought to be unrealistically high as an indication of actual short-term need). It is assumed that 15% of the estimated housed population would move to a site if a pitch were available. This percentage is slightly higher than the survey found. The net balance of the two estimated flows is need for a single pitch. |
| <b>North Yorkshire</b>                   |   |
|  | Estimates that 30% of the housed population (210 of 700) would move to sites and that 61% of households on sites (119 of 195) would move into housing. Both these figures may overestimate realistic levels of movement between housing and sites. Using such a large base for the housed population may provide significant scope for overstating requirements. It is unclear how many interviews these movement percentages were based on; this could affect the reliability of the estimates.  |
| <b>South Yorkshire</b>                   |   |
|  | Movement from housing to sites is based on those households in housing who expect the whole household to move to a site in the next 12 months. Takes survey findings from each LA area and grosses this up to the population in each area. This is a potential issue in Doncaster due to the small sample of housed respondents and the apparently large population in housing.   |
| <b>West Yorkshire</b>                    |   |
|  | Survey findings are used to estimate flows in both directions, each of which is grossed to the estimated base population. Results in a net movement from houses to sites.   |

### **Comments**

Again, this is a problematic area for GTAA's primarily because of problems in getting a realistic picture of Gypsies and Travellers in housing, and assessing 'realistic' likely movements which might result from survey answers to hypothetical questions about possible future movements. It is also an area where 'need' is difficult or impossible to distinguish from 'aspiration'.

Yorkshire and The Humber GTAA's treat this element in a reasonable and broadly consistent manner. All GTAA's apart from North and North East Lincs use survey findings as indicating movement whereas North and North East Lincs overrides these with the researchers' professional judgement. Like all GTAA's, the South Yorkshire study grosses up to the population of households in housing; this might lead to an overstatement due to the small sample of bricks and mortar respondents in one local authority compared to the overall population size, i.e. the responses from a very small sample could have skewed the findings for the overall population.

Table 9: Supply Issues

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>East Riding of Yorkshire</b>          |   |
|  | Just one element is used: pitches vacated by mobility into housing. This is taken to be synonymous with pitch/site turnover.  |
| <b>Hull</b>                              |   |
|  | LA pitch vacancies are estimated on the basis of past turnover rates from management records. Planned additional pitches are also included.   |
| <b>North and North East Lincolnshire</b> |   |
|  | Potential elements of supply are considered from pitches being brought back into use, new sites planned and vacancies on social sites. All are estimated to be zero. This is reasonable in an area without social sites.  |
| <b>North Yorkshire</b>                   |   |
|  | Essentially just two elements are included: pitches back into use/LA vacancies and pitches vacated by mobility into housing.  |
| <b>South Yorkshire</b>                   |   |
|  | A number of separate elements are considered: pitches back into use; planned additional pitches; pitches vacated by mobility (this uses an average turnover rate based on LA records reduced to account for potential within-Study Area mobility); current LA vacancies (this includes a total of 12 on a 'hard to let' site which needs to be refurbished to become attractive – these are not incorporated into the 'need' model as a balance); private site vacancies; and vacancies arising from movement into housing. |
| <b>West Yorkshire</b>                    |   |
|  | Supply arising from unused pitches being brought back into use and sites planned or in the pipeline is considered (all zero). Possible pitch supply from vacancies arising through turnover on LA sites is not taken into account.  |

### **Comments**

Requirements for additional pitches are calculated by estimating need and subtracting any pitches over and above current authorised provision which are known to or are thought very likely to become available during the assessment period.

All GTAA's take broadly similar views on the supply element depending upon the pitches available within each study area. The main difference is in the West Yorkshire GTAA where the omission of LA site vacancies is inconsistent with the other GTAA's and could, arguably, have the effect of overstating requirements slightly.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>8</sup> The over-statement however is possibly 'balanced' by a possible understatement, within the West Yorkshire GTAA, from the need arising from unauthorised encampments.

Table 10: Transient Needs

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>East Riding of Yorkshire</b>          |  |
|  | Not formally assessed  |
| <b>Hull</b>                              |  |
|  | The estimated need for transit pitches is 5. Information is taken from local authority estimates of the number of unauthorised encampments and number of caravans. The study calculates average encampment size (8 caravans) and applies the survey average number of caravans per household (1.7) to estimate the average number of households per encampment (5). This is taken as the estimate for transit pitches required. There is an implicit assumption that there will only be one encampment to be accommodated at any time. There are comments in the recommendations about providing residential pitches large enough to accommodate family visitors which could relieve the need for more formal provision.   |
| <b>North and North East Lincolnshire</b> |  |
|  | The estimated need for transit pitches is 10 pitches between the two LA areas. The estimate is made on the basis of LA records of unauthorised encampments and survey findings on the potential use of transit sites in the area. Very broadly, the study assumes that 25% of the estimated families involved in unauthorised encampments in a year (10 households) will need transit accommodation. There are a number of transit pitches on authorised private sites in the Study Area; these are not referred to explicitly in the transit pitch need calculations.   |
| <b>North Yorkshire</b>                   |  |
|  | Not formally assessed. Respondents are asked about transit needs and LAs are ranked according to their preferences as hosting a transit site: Harrogate, Scarborough, Selby and York are the most favoured locations.  |
| <b>South Yorkshire</b>                   |  |
|  | Not assessed formally in a model but comments on the need for transit accommodation and potential broad locations for such accommodation   |
| <b>West Yorkshire</b>                    |  |
|  | The estimated need for transit pitches is 19. LA records of unauthorised encampments and survey findings underlie the estimate. The calculation starts with the 39 pitches identified as needed from unauthorised encampments in the residential estimates (number of encampments times % of survey respondents wanting a residential pitch in the Study Area). The assumption is that, since 20 pitches have been included in the residential model, the remaining 19 represent transit need. This appears to be illogical since transient need is normally based upon all encampments rather than a proportion, and on families involved rather than encampments alone. The report argues that transit site provision may not always be appropriate and some Gypsies and Travellers would not use it. The report shows considerable scepticism about the usefulness of formal transit site provision. These arguments are valid, but the calculation made of transit need remains illogical. |

**Comments**

Assessments of transient requirements are generally less sophisticated and less quantified than residential pitch assessments. This is common across all GTAs to date and reflects difficulties of predicting such factors as need generated by transient populations, length of time people will stop on transient accommodation which affects the number of families which can be accommodated in a year and realistic vacancy rates. There is no widely accepted good practice model approach yet in this field.

Three of the Yorkshire and The Humber GTAA's make no attempt to quantify transit requirements. The remaining GTAA's use broadly similar approaches (use of LA data combined with survey findings) to achieve a pitch requirement estimate. The West Yorkshire GTAA makes some potential errors in the calculation of requirements based on the approach used. However, as little is known about how transit pitches may be used in the future it is difficult to say if this will, in practice, mean an over- or understatement of requirements.

Table 11: Travelling Patterns

| <b>East Riding of Yorkshire</b>          |   |
|--|---|
|  | Respondents tended to cite travelling to fairs and to see family and friends as the main drivers of travelling. Says that there are strong linkages between the East Riding, North Yorkshire and Cumbria.   |
| <b>Hull</b>                              |   |
|  | Most travelling patterns appear to be within Yorkshire and The Humber. Specific places that were mentioned included: York, Leeds, Doncaster, Wakefield, Scarborough, Bridlington and Cottingham. A minority appear to travel more widely and gave unspecific 'all over' answers. Most of those living on sites or in houses no longer travelled. Those who did travel referred mostly to holidays and family events. Places mentioned include: Pickering, Thirsk, York, Bridlington, Scotland, Northamptonshire, 'the South', Kent and Peterborough.  |
| <b>North and North East Lincolnshire</b> |   |
|  | Comments that records from North Lincolnshire Council showed that 6 families accounted for 79% of the 33 recorded unauthorised encampments in 2006. This suggests a considerable amount of short-distance travelling within the Study Area – or repeated visits from outside the area. Survey respondents on sites and in houses mostly do not travel or only travel seasonally. Travelling destinations included some 'everywhere' answers and fairs at Appleby, Cambridgeshire and Stow. Other destinations mentioned included: Doncaster, Newark, Romford, Nottingham, Grantham, Cambridge, London, Manchester and Lowestoft. The Report notes the existence of an East Coast travelling pattern broadly along the A1. |
| <b>North Yorkshire</b>                   |   |
|  | Not mentioned   |
| <b>South Yorkshire</b>                   |   |
|  | Mentions that young respondents wanted to see more site development to facilitate visits to gatherings and fairs. Respondents noted the importance of both transit pitches to enable travelling and good winter bases.  |
| <b>West Yorkshire</b>                    |   |
|  | Information on travelling is analysed for the whole sample regardless of current accommodation. Overall, 46% never travel and a further 34% travel only seasonally or once a year. Fairs, holidays and visiting relatives are the most important reasons for travelling. Fairs mentioned at Appleby, Brigg and Stow on the Wold, but the report contains no further information about geography of travelling.  |

### **Comments**

Travelling is a particularly difficult aspect to attempt to understand and quantify. This is because Gypsies and Travellers answer questions about their travelling patterns in a climate of underprovision of both residential and legitimate transient provision and it is not known how such underprovision impacts upon travelling. It is also because travelling can be cultural and familial and includes visits to fairs and regular family events, or it can be individual and be led by work opportunities and holidays.

In terms of the GTAA's it is very difficult to identify a clear pattern. There is a good degree of internal travelling by existing residents – particularly the case in North and North East Lincolnshire, East Riding and Hull. There is less information in the GTAA's about cross-boundary travelling both inter- and intra-regional. Very broadly, two routes appear to dominate: the route(s) to Appleby Fair in Cumbria, and the Southerly route of the A1.



Table 12: Travelling Showpeople

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>East Riding of Yorkshire</b>          |   |
|  | Two Showpeople were interviewed during the survey but there are no requirements arising from these respondents. States that the population is small as they could not locate respondents. Does not say whether they attempted to contact the Showmen's Guild for information on members in the area. Not clear if the two respondents have been excluded from the model when working out the requirements for Gypsies and Travellers. |
| <b>Hull</b>                              |   |
|  | No resident Travelling Showpeople identified in Hull. Showmen's Guild contacted for information. The GTAA concludes that there will be nil need for residential accommodation for Travelling Showpeople.  |
| <b>North and North East Lincolnshire</b> |   |
|  | Current provision is taken from LA records. Five interviews were carried out with Travelling Showpeople. The survey indicates nil need for additional plots at present. The GTAA applies a 2% p.a. rate for family formation 2007–2012 and 2012–2016, resulting in requirements for 2 households in each period.  |
| <b>North Yorkshire</b>                   |   |
|  | Not assessed and states that the indigenous Showpeople population is too small to permit an assessment of needs.  |
| <b>South Yorkshire</b>                   |   |
|  | No model as such used to produce requirements. States that there is an immediate and pressing need for affordable accommodation for Showpeople. However, Doncaster has completed a separate assessment of Showpeople needs.   |
| <b>West Yorkshire</b>                    |   |
|  | Information from the Showmen's Guild on current provision, and from the GTAA survey. A model of need and supply is used similar to that used for residential needs. However, the only entry other than current provision (85 pitches) is for concealed households/family growth to 2012 (29) reflecting current overcrowding. Family growth 2013–2015 is 11 pitches and total requirement 2008–2015 = 40 pitches.                     |

### **Comments**

Approaches to estimating requirements for Travelling Showpeople are rather less developed than for residential pitches for Gypsies and Travellers. One problem is the diversity of current provision (large depots to small single family yards; Travelling Showmen who have rather different needs). Another is whether the appropriate 'unit' in calculations is a single nuclear family, an extended family, or a yard/site (where members of an extended family wish to remain together for cultural, social and business reasons).

Just three GTAAs (Hull, North and North East Lincs and West Yorkshire) assess the need for Travelling Showpeople. With the exception of West Yorkshire these GTAAs present modest requirements compared to Gypsy and Traveller need.

## Estimating Residential Pitch Requirements for Gypsies and Travellers

All the GTAAAs are broadly similar in terms of general approach they adopt to estimating residential pitch requirements. They each use a combination of secondary data, survey information and standard assumptions to estimate need arising due to each element in the model. This is then compared with estimated supply of pitches to reach an estimate of requirements. They represent, in a sense, top-down studies where the same assumptions are applied across all sites of a specified type across the Study Area (on the grounds that sample numbers would be too small to be reliable for individual sites/areas).

All the Yorkshire and The Humber GTAAAs, when estimating requirements for residential pitches for Gypsies and Travellers, include estimates (where appropriate) for:

- Family formation (South Yorkshire also includes a separate overcrowding element). Most GTAAAs explicitly take steps to remove the possibility of double counting between allowances for concealed households and family formation (the exceptions are North Yorkshire and South Yorkshire)
- Unauthorised development of sites (where applicable)
- Unauthorised encampments
- Movement between sites and housing
- Expiry of temporary planning permissions
- Supply of pitches likely to become available.

In this they follow CLG Guidance and conform to accepted good practice.

All the GTAAAs split residential pitch requirements between local authorities. Following the practice adopted by most GTAAAs, they do this on a 'need where it arises' basis, effectively using the same approach/model to estimate need/supply as at sub-regional level. This has an automatic tendency to reinforce current patterns of provision (leading to family formation) and unauthorised sites.

There is some variety of time periods covered by the GTAAAs (see Table 13).

Table 13: Summary of time periods covered by the GTAAAs

| GTAA            | Start date | Time periods                    | Number of years                         |
|-----------------|------------|---------------------------------|---|
| East Riding     | 2008       | 2008–2015                       | 8 years in single period                |
| Hull            | 2006       | 2006–2011; 2011–2016; 2016–2021 | 5, 10 and 15 years                      |
| N & NE Lincs    | 2007       | 2007–2012; 2012–2016            | 5 + 4 years                             |
| North Yorkshire | 2007       | 2007–2015                       | 9 years, effectively in a single period |
| South Yorkshire | 2006       | 2006–2011                       | 5 years                                 |
| West Yorkshire  | 2008       | 2008–2012; 2013–2015            | 5 + 3 years                             |

In Hull, North and North East Lincolnshire and West Yorkshire, where separate estimates of requirements are made beyond Year 5, a standard growth rate of 3% a year is assumed to take account of continuing family formation. The underlying assumption here is that current backlogs will have been cleared in the first 5 years. Movement from housing to sites might continue into a later period, but is thought to be unpredictable and not included.

The differences of timing and of time periods covered in the GTAA's obviously present problems when seeking to establish regional requirements for 5 or 10 years.

**Broadly, the above analysis of how Yorkshire and The Humber GTAA's estimate residential pitch requirements for Gypsies and Travellers leads us to conclude that, while there are detailed differences in methods of calculation, the 'models' used are, in the main, sufficiently consistent and robust for the findings to be relied upon to give a regional picture of pitch requirements.<sup>9</sup> There is a challenge in reconciling the different time periods covered by the GTAA's.**

### **Estimating Transient Pitch Requirements for Gypsies and Travellers**

Requirements for transient, short-stay accommodation are assessed by only three of the GTAA's (Hull, North and North East Lincolnshire and West Yorkshire). Transient requirements are assessed in less depth, and with less quantification, than residential requirements. Less certainty seems to attach to the results because:

- This is not an area covered in any detail by CLG Guidance on needs assessments.
- Relatively small numbers of transient Gypsies and Travellers were interviewed in the GTAA's.
- There is less understanding of how a need to accommodate a specific number of families in a year should translate into actual pitch/site provision requirements, or what type of accommodation (formal transit sites or less formal stopping places) should be provided.
- Very few transit sites are provided currently so there is no hard evidence on how they would work, whether they would be used and so on.

In this context, and having looked at the sub-regional GTAA's, we conclude that the GTAA's help build up some indications of need for transient accommodation across the Region, but that this is more impressionistic than requirements for residential pitches. Because of the lack of quantification in some GTAA's, we have made assumptions ourselves to develop a more quantified picture of transient pitch across the Region (see Table A2).

---

<sup>9</sup> The South Yorkshire GTAA could have a tendency to overstate requirements on one factor yet understate on another. Similarly, the West Yorkshire GTAA omitted pitch vacancies as an element of supply and potentially underestimated need from unauthorised encampments. In consideration that these factors work in opposite directions in each GTAA, in the absence of more definitive evidence, it is reasonable to accept the overall need figures as reasonable.

## **Estimating Plot Requirements for Travelling Showpeople**

Except in North Yorkshire, the GTAA's considered the needs of Travelling Showpeople to a greater or lesser extent. They mostly provide some estimate of plot or yard requirements, although these may be zero. Again there are some uncertainties:

- The assessment of the needs of Travelling Showpeople was not included in published guidance.
- Only West Yorkshire included significant numbers of Travelling Showpeople respondents in the sample. The remaining GTAA's interviewed small numbers. This distribution seems to reflect the population in the Study Areas (except South Yorkshire where a separate Showpeople assessment has been produced specifically for Doncaster).
- There can be problems in translating individual need into plot requirements. For example, a family yard may be occupied by the head of a family and his three married sons, each with their own families. The extended family wants to remain together. The yard is seriously overcrowded. Is the requirement for 1 nuclear family 'overflow' plot or for a larger yard to accommodate all 4 nuclear family units together?

We conclude that the assessment of requirements for Travelling Showpeople in the Yorkshire and The Humber region requires some further study, particularly in North Yorkshire in order to more fully understand the diverse needs of this diverse group and how they might best be met. In other areas the assessment of requirements is as can be expected at the current time.

## 4. Regional Residential Requirements

This section reports on the findings from the GTAA's. All the figures are included in Table A1 in the Appendix which includes individual local authorities as well as GTAA sub-regions. We look first at Gypsy and Traveller residential pitch requirements as presented in the GTAA's and then at an estimate of residential pitch requirements over two 5-year periods: Years 1–5 and Years 6–10. We then look at transient requirements for Gypsies and Travellers and plot requirements for Travelling Showpeople.

### Residential Pitch Requirements as specified in the GTAA's

Table A1 details the residential pitch requirements for the sub-regions and individual authorities. Because the GTAA's cover different time periods, it is difficult to bring estimates together. The sub-regional levels of requirements over the GTAA periods are:

|                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| The Humber      | 140 (variously 8-, 9- and 10-year periods)            |
| North Yorkshire | 265 (9-year period)                                   |
| South Yorkshire | 207 (5-year period)                                   |
| West Yorkshire  | 124 (8-year period)                                   |
| <b>Region</b>   | <b>736</b> (variously 5-, 8-, 9- and 10-year periods) |

Thus, as specified in the GTAA's the estimated requirement across the Region is 736 additional residential pitches but over very varied time periods.

Because of the variable time periods covered, and in order to allow a consistent regional picture of requirements to be built up, we have re-calculated some of the assessments to make estimates for Years 1–5 and 6–10. This involves a number of assumptions which are described below. The estimates at local authority and sub-regional level are in Appendix Table A2 at the end of this note.

### Residential Pitch Requirements Years 1–5

Sub-regional pitch requirements for Years 1–5 are:

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| The Humber                             | 123        |
| North Yorkshire                        | 208        |
| South Yorkshire                        | 207        |
| West Yorkshire                         | 101        |
| <b>Yorkshire and The Humber Region</b> | <b>639</b> |

The figures for local authorities covered by the Hull, North and North East Lincolnshire and South and West Yorkshire GTAA's are taken directly from the GTAA. East Riding and North Yorkshire GTAA's both presented requirement estimates for a single longer period (8 and 9 years respectively). The figures for East Riding and North Yorkshire have been apportioned between time periods, based on the following assumptions:

**East Riding:** all the current shortfall as identified by the GTAA is allocated to years 1–5. The change items used in the GTAA to calculate additional need to 2015 (projected household formation and projected pitch supply from movement from sites to housing) are expressed in annual terms by dividing by 8. The annualised figure for each is multiplied by 5 and the net difference (–2 pitches) is deducted from the shortfall figure.

**North Yorkshire:** all the current shortfall as identified by the GTAA is allocated to years 1–5. The change items used in the GTAA to calculate additional need to 2015 (projected household formation, projected movement from housing to sites and projected pitch supply from movement from sites to housing) are expressed in annual terms by dividing by 9. The annualised figure for each is multiplied by 5 and the net difference (+95 pitches) is added to the shortfall figure. The same calculation is made at local authority level drawing on information in Table 6.1 of the GTAA report.

In addition, to reflect the findings from the earlier regional study (Powell, 2006) which stated all areas should increase provision, the minus requirement figure in Richmondshire (North Yorkshire) has been reset to zero. This rationale has also been applied to Year 6–10 requirements below.

The 5-year requirement can be compared with the total number of authorised pitches available in the Region. Table 14 shows this for the Region and sub-regions. Overall, pitch requirements represent around four-fifths of current authorised provision which is a relatively high rate compared with other regions. Individual GTAAs vary with South Yorkshire and North Yorkshire showing respectively the lowest and highest implied increases in provision.

Table 14: Comparison between current authorised pitch provision and residential pitch requirements, Years 1–5

| Sub-region      | Current provision | Requirements Years 1–5 | Req. as % provision |
|-----------------|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| The Humber      | 156               | 123                    | 97                  |
| North Yorkshire | 195               | 208                    | 107                 |
| South Yorkshire | 315               | 207                    | 66                  |
| West Yorkshire  | 143               | 101                    | 71                  |
| <b>Region</b>   | <b>809</b>        | <b>639</b>             | <b>79</b>           |

At local authority level, Table A2 shows a wide variety of estimated requirements, ranging from 0 in Richmondshire to the 114-pitch 5-year requirement of Doncaster.

### **Residential Pitch Requirements, Years 6–10**

Re-calculations were needed for all but one GTAA (Hull) in order to provide broadly comparable estimates at regional level for residential pitch requirements in years 6–10. The summary picture is:

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| The Humber                             | 30         |
| North Yorkshire                        | 102        |
| South Yorkshire                        | 83         |
| West Yorkshire                         | 28         |
| <b>Yorkshire and The Humber Region</b> | <b>243</b> |

The derivation of the figures is as follows:

**East Riding of Yorkshire:** the annualised estimates for household growth and pitch supply referred to above were each multiplied by 5. Estimated supply exceeded need by 1 pitch. This figure has been reset to 0.

**Hull:** GTAA figures used directly.

**North and North East Lincolnshire:** In the GTAA, the second time period covers 4 rather than 5 years. Following the GTAA approach, a 3% p.a. household growth rate has been applied to a 2011 base of current provision plus Year 1–5 requirements for 5 years.

**North Yorkshire:** the annualised estimates for household growth, movement from houses to sites and pitch supply from movement from sites to houses referred to above were each multiplied by 5. In this case, estimated growth in need exceeds estimated continuing pitch supply. This produced negative requirements in both Harrogate and Richmondshire, which have been reset to 0.

**South Yorkshire:** In the GTAA, no estimate was made for a second time period. We have applied a 3% p.a. household growth rate to a Year 6 base of current provision plus Year 1–5 requirements for 5 years.

**West Yorkshire:** In the GTAA, the second time period covers 3 rather than 5 years. Following the GTAA approach, a 3% p.a. household growth rate has been applied to a 2011 base of current provision plus Year 1–5 requirements for 5 years.

Pitch requirements Years 6–10 are significantly lower than those of Years 1–5. This reflects the implicit assumption that any current backlog apparent in unauthorised developments and concealed households should be addressed as quickly as possible within the first time period. Levels of estimated requirements for Years 6–10 are relatively lower in Humber and West Yorkshire sub-regions. Doncaster has the highest requirement at 56 pitches.

It is believed that the revised figures, contained in Table A2, are the best figures available for district distribution of pitches on a ‘need where it arises’ basis at this time. It may be possible, if alternative figures are required, to engage in a process of generating alternative Options for pitch distribution similar to that undertaken in other regions (see Chapter 8). Such Options may seek advice from Partner Authorities and/or explore issues associated with, for example, land availability and suitability.

## 5. Regional Transit Requirements

### The GTAA's

Table A1 in the Appendix shows that GTAA's treat requirements for transient accommodation in different ways, which makes it impossible to sum GTAA estimates to produce a figure for the Region. Some GTAA's did not quantify provision reflecting the difficulties of making assumptions as to the type of provision required, average length of stay, necessary vacancy rates and so on.

Three important points emerge from the GTAA's:

- The GTAA's that included an attempt to ascertain the extent of transient pitch requirements suggest the need for some sort of short-stay accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers in each local authority area. This would indicate that if the remaining GTAA's had looked to quantify transit provision, some need would have been identified in almost all local authority areas. This reflects the fact that unauthorised encampments can occur almost everywhere, but more fundamentally, that Gypsies and Travellers pursuing a nomadic lifestyle should be able to stop legally in all areas. Some form of provision is required everywhere if tensions between the Travelling and settled communities caused by unauthorised encampment are to be reduced, and the very worst living conditions experienced by Gypsies and Travellers are to be improved.
- The GTAA's which discuss the issue make clear that transient provision should take the form of a network. Unless Gypsies and Travellers can move legally between places, a travelling lifestyle will not be possible. Lack of somewhere to move on to increases the likelihood that provision will not function as intended because of pressure to stay as long as possible. This would greatly increase management difficulties.
- It is equally clear that there is no single model of transient accommodation. The GTAA's refer to ensuring that new residential provision is designed so that families can accommodate short-stay visitors on their pitches, thus removing one element of unauthorised encampment. They also refer to 'stopping places'. The West Yorkshire GTAA presents significant scepticism about the usefulness of purpose-built transit provision. The Hull GTAA states that residential provision should have transit provision attached in order to facilitate visits by family. North and North East Lincolnshire share an allocated of 10 transit pitches which should be operationalised as this makes sense to each LA.



## Estimates of transient pitch requirements across the Region

In recognition of the fact that a quantified assessment of transient pitch requirements will be needed, we have made estimates at local authority level for East Riding, North Yorkshire and South Yorkshire. The assumptions used are:

- Transit need is required in all local authority areas
- Estimates are made on the basis of caravans counted on unauthorised encampments in the January 2008 Caravan Count using the following reasoning:
  - Where there are 0–14 caravans there should be 2 transit pitches
  - Where there are 15–40 caravans there should be 5 transit pitches
  - Where there are >40 caravans there should be 10 transit pitches

At sub-regional level the estimates are as follows:

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| The Humber                             | 20        |
| North Yorkshire                        | 16        |
| South Yorkshire                        | 8         |
| West Yorkshire                         | 20        |
| <b>Yorkshire and The Humber Region</b> | <b>64</b> |

These are incorporated into Table A2 in the Appendix together with associated estimates at local authority level.

As stated by a number of GTAAs in the Region, we think that this transit provision could take a number of forms. The precise form in any area should be determined by what makes sense locally, including: pitches on formal transit sites; transit pitches on residential sites; and informal stopping places.

The normal assumption in GTAAs is that there will be no further requirement for additional transient accommodation beyond Year 5 unless the scale of travelling increases.

## 6. Qualitative Guidance on Site Requirements for Gypsies and Travellers

This section looks at some of the more qualitative findings of the GTAAs on sites for Gypsies and Travellers. It looks first at findings on different Traveller groupings, then at indications on preferred site size and tenure, and location.

### Different Traveller Groups

The GTAAs do not quantify requirements in terms of different Gypsy and Traveller ethnic groups. They do, however, give some indication of the diversity of the regional Gypsy and Traveller population and how characteristics vary between sub-regions. Table 15 shows the ethnic mix of Gypsies and Travellers interviewed in each GTAA survey.

Table 15: Gypsy and Traveller Groupings by GTAA

| Group                          | East Riding | Hull | North & North East<br>Lincolnshire | North Yorkshire | South Yorkshire | West Yorkshire |
|--------------------------------|-------------|------|------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| <b>Sample number</b>           | 77          | 55   | 57                                 | 308             | 339             | 198            |
|                                | %           | %    | %                                  | %               | %               | %              |
| <b>Romany/English Gypsy</b>    | 86          | 53   | 81                                 | 54              | NA              | 43             |
| <b>Irish Traveller</b>         | 0           | 4    | 4                                  | 23              | NA              | 25             |
| <b>Travelling Showpeople</b>   | 3           | 0    | 9                                  | 22              | NA              | 15             |
| <b>New Traveller/Traveller</b> | 4           | 4    | 0                                  | 1               | NA              | 1              |
| <b>Other</b>                   | 7           | 38*  | 4                                  | <1              | NA              | 16*            |

\* The respondents described as 'other' tend to illustrate the difficulty in classifying Gypsies and Travellers and most people who are classified as 'other' on the survey tend to describe themselves as the more general 'Traveller'.

Romany or English Gypsies are clearly the largest group in all sub-regions. This is then followed by more general 'other' Travellers and then by broadly equal numbers of Irish Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.

The GTAAs tend not to give indications of differences in site requirements attributable to different Traveller groups.

### Site Size and Tenure

Most of the GTAAs report findings on preferred site size. While some respondents in each area favoured very small or large sites, the consensus appears to be for residential sites with more than 5 but fewer than 20 pitches. However, a number of GTAAs make the point that the number of pitches

appears to be intertwined with the tenure of the site (private or social) and who would also reside on the site.

Overall, GTAAAs revealed a strong preference for family-owned sites over sites owned either by a local authority or another Gypsy or Traveller. The exception to this was North Yorkshire where slightly more people preferred council management. Perhaps not surprisingly, there are indications that Gypsies and Travellers living on social rented sites (and in housing) favour local authority/RSL sites, while those on private sites prefer private sites. The implications are that a variety of sites, provided in different ways, is required to best meet preferences.

## **Site Location**

With the exception of the separate Humber GTAAAs, which all cover single or two authorities only, the GTAAAs provide little direct evidence of locational preferences at local authority scale. Several reports comment that most interviewees, other than those in transit, expressed a desire to remain in the same general area. This suggests that a 'need where it arises' basis for requirements may accord with Gypsy and Traveller preferences (which themselves may be constrained by existing provision and perceptions of realistic opportunities). It is very difficult within the confines of a GTAA to fully understand these issues in the current climate of underprovision. These issues were addressed in the previous regional assessment of need and possibly reflect a degree of constraint on site options and potential displacement from other areas.

There is also little guidance about lower scale location preferences – other than a clear desire to avoid poor environments next to rubbish tips or electricity pylons. However, there is nothing in the GTAAAs to suggest that the residential criteria for Gypsies and Travellers are very different from those of the settled community.

## 7. Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Need

Table A1 in the Appendix shows that GTAA's estimate regional requirements as 42 additional plots/yards for Travelling Showpeople. Requirements are distributed as follows:

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| The Humber                             | 2         |
| North Yorkshire                        | 0         |
| South Yorkshire                        | 24        |
| West Yorkshire                         | 29        |
| <b>Yorkshire and The Humber Region</b> | <b>55</b> |

The North Yorkshire GTAA did not assess the need for Travelling Showpeople; therefore a zero requirement may be misleading. The South Yorkshire GTAA did not present a formal model for the assessment of Travelling Showpeople need; therefore these requirements lack a degree of robustness.

Table A2 in the Appendix also includes the Travelling Showpeople estimate as provided by the Doncaster Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Needs Assessment of 117 additional plots by 2013. The sub-region and regional totals are therefore:

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| The Humber                             | 2          |
| North Yorkshire                        | 0          |
| South Yorkshire                        | 141        |
| West Yorkshire                         | 29         |
| <b>Yorkshire and The Humber Region</b> | <b>172</b> |

Current provision for Travelling Showpeople does not appear to be evenly spread and is concentrated in parts of West and South Yorkshire. This underlies the pattern of requirements and, in the case of Doncaster, risks significantly compounding provision in a small number of areas.

At local authority level, purely on the basis of need where it arises and based on the GTAA's that assessed the accommodation need for Travelling Showpeople, the majority of authorities have no requirement for additional plots for Travelling Showpeople.

Only North and North East Lincolnshire and West Yorkshire GTAA's make any assessment of plot requirements for Travelling Showpeople beyond Year 5. In both cases, an allowance is made for family formation. The rates assumed differ: 2% p.a. in North and North East Lincolnshire (2 additional plots in Years 6–10) and 3% in West Yorkshire (11 additional plots in Years 6–10). The remaining GTAA's do not provide sufficient consistent information on current provision or demographic characteristics to allow us to make realistic estimates of requirements beyond Year 5 across the Region.

Aside from the Doncaster Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Needs Assessment, the GTAA's provide little qualitative information on plot needs for Travelling Showpeople. The Showmen's Guild now recommends that plots

should be at least 100 × 150 feet in size and preferably larger to allow for equipment storage and testing and space for residential accommodation. This suggests a density of 5–7 plots per hectare, which would mean a land requirement of some 34 hectares across the Region to meet a requirement of 172 plots.

In order to ensure that the needs of Travelling Showpeople are taken fully into account in line with Circular 04/2007 it is recommended that all local authorities within the region work towards providing a quantified assessment of accommodation shortfall.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> This would exclude North Lincolnshire, North East Lincolnshire, Bradford, Calderdale, Kirklees, Leeds, Wakefield and Doncaster where plot requirements have already been provided.

## **8. Yorkshire and The Humber: The Region in Context**

This section briefly reviews how other Regional Planning Bodies have gone about identifying accommodation requirements for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople and allocating pitch/plot requirements at local authority level as required by Circulars 01/2006 and 04/2007. It concentrates on the three southern regions (South West, East of England and South East) about which we have the most information. These three regions have all either undertaken or are undertaking a single issue review of their Regional Spatial Strategy on Gypsy and Traveller sites. Here, we briefly describe the approach taken in each case and draw out good practice points where possible.

### **South West**

In the South West the single issue review is complete in that, following an Examination in Public (EiP) and subsequent Panel report<sup>11</sup>, revised figures for additional residential and transit pitch requirements for Gypsies and Travellers and plot requirements for Travelling Showpeople 2006–2011 are incorporated into the Draft Revised Regional Strategy Incorporating the Secretary of State's Proposed Changes which was subject to public consultation between July and October 2008.<sup>12</sup>

The following features of the South West experience may be relevant:

- The single issue review was well advanced before the issue of Circular 04/2007. In the main, therefore, it concentrated on residential and transit pitch needs of Gypsies and Travellers. Work on the needs of Travelling Showpeople was commissioned at a very late stage, and the results were fed into the Examination in Public. Travelling Showpeople plot requirements are included in the Draft Revised RSS only at a county level (including unitary authorities where appropriate). Later RSS reviews commencing after the issue of Circular 04/2007 will have to incorporate the needs of Travelling Showpeople much more comprehensively.
- Pitch requirement figures for Gypsies and Travellers (residential and transit) were taken from GTAA's and Advice provided by strategic local authorities. Benchmarking commissioned by the Regional Assembly found a number of the GTAA's not to be robust and made proposals for the ways in which requirement figures might be improved. In the main, the benchmarking findings were incorporated into the recommendations from the EiP Panel and subsequently into the Secretary of State's Proposed Changes. Some amendments were also made to take account of evidence of requirements presented at the EiP by local authority and Gypsy and Traveller organisation representatives. The EiP Panel accepted that, although flawed,

---

<sup>11</sup> See <http://www.gos.gov.uk/497666/docs/166217/622079/fullpanelreport>

<sup>12</sup> See [http://gosw.limehouse.co.uk/portal/regional\\_strategies/drss?pointId=109242](http://gosw.limehouse.co.uk/portal/regional_strategies/drss?pointId=109242)

benchmarked GTAAAs usually provide the best available evidence of pitch requirements.

- In the South West, no alternative pitch distribution Options were developed for sustainability appraisal or public consultation. Consultation took place on a single draft policy including a Preferred Option which, being based primarily on GTAAAs, reflects 'need where it arises'. Although this was not specifically challenged at the EiP or by the Panel in its report, it is unlikely that other Regions would be permitted to consider a single pitch distribution only; this fails to meet wider guidelines for RSS reviews.
- There are several unusual features in the South West, including high numbers of New Travellers whose pitch/site needs are rather different from those of traditional Gypsies and Travellers. Need for pitches/sites to accommodate transient requirements figured largely at the EiP. The Panel recommendations, and the Proposed Changes, increased transit pitch allocations beyond levels in the proposed policy and gave a pragmatic 5-pitch allocation to all authorities other than those with no record of unauthorised encampment. In this area, the Panel seems to have been minded to follow the approach strongly urged by Gypsy and Traveller organisations that there should be no 'no-go' areas for Gypsies and Travellers and that every authority should make some authorised provision. Such reasoning was still more apparent in the East of England (see below).

These points reflect the very 'early' position of the South West in the development of regional planning approaches to site provision for Travelling communities. Later RSS reviews should fully incorporate the requirements of Travelling Showpeople, and should involve the consideration of Options for pitch distributions. GTAA benchmarking appears to have been vindicated within an explicit recognition that the first round of GTAAAs will inevitably be imperfect. There is implicit support for an approach to pitch distribution aimed at maximising choice of locations for Gypsies and Travellers.

## **East of England**

The East of England was the first region to start a single issue review, but followed a more lengthy procedure than in the South West. Public consultation on pitch requirement numbers and two distribution Options took place in 2007. A draft policy incorporating the Preferred Option was issued in February 2008,<sup>13</sup> and an EiP was held in October with the Panel reporting in December 2008.<sup>14</sup> As in the South West, the review did not deal with the requirements of Travelling Showpeople, although the EiP explored how they might be incorporated at such a late stage. The Panel report recommends county-wide (including unitary authorities) provision requirements based mainly on

---

<sup>13</sup> See <http://www.eera.gov.uk/What-we-do/developing-regional-strategies/east-of-england-plan/planning-for-gypsy-and-traveller-accommodation-single-issue-review/-/gypsy-and-traveller-draft-policy/>.

<sup>14</sup> See [http://www.gos.gov.uk/goeast/planning/regional\\_planning/687221/](http://www.gos.gov.uk/goeast/planning/regional_planning/687221/).

evidence submitted by the Showmen's Guild of Great Britain. Unlike the South West, the review focused exclusively on residential pitch requirements for Gypsies and Travellers. Again the EiP explored how transit pitch needs could be incorporated and the Panel report proposes county-wide pitch numbers based on evidence from GTAAs, local authorities and Gypsy and Traveller organisations given at the EiP, with the size and type of sites to be developed to be determined following local studies.

Relevant points from the East of England review approach, EiP and Panel report concerning the approach to planning for Gypsy and Traveller residential pitches include:

- The GTAAs in the East of England were mostly carried out before guidance was issued on methods, and many were found not to be sound by benchmarking. A formula, based on the statistical relationship between caravan numbers on existing authorised sites and unauthorised developments, and pitch requirements as assessed in 'robust' GTAAs, was used to estimate pitch requirements in many parts of the region. The EiP Panel did not dissent from this approach (accepting it as the best available at the time) but felt that the resulting figures are likely to be a clear minimum estimate, likely to underestimate desired movement from houses to sites and desired movement into the Region. They also thought the requirements were likely to underestimate the needs of New Travellers, and they adjusted the regional figures upwards (slightly) on the basis of evidence submitted on New Travellers in one district. As in the South West, the Panel demonstrated an unwillingness to significantly challenge pitch requirements from GTAAs and benchmarking as submitted by the Regional Assembly unless presented with hard evidence that those estimates should be revised.
- The estimates of requirements in the policy relate to the period 2006–2011. For later periods, the Panel endorsed the use of an assumed growth rate of 3% per annum compound for estimating requirements.
- In the East of England the Preferred Option for the distribution of pitch requirements between local authorities was not purely on the basis of meeting need where it arose. The Preferred Option involved a measure of redistribution such that every local authority was allocated at least 15 pitches. The redistributed pitches were deducted from the 'need where it arises' requirements of the three authorities with the highest requirements. The rationale for this approach put forward by the Regional Assembly included both increasing flexibility and choice for Gypsies and Travellers, and helping the urgent delivery of pitches by maximising development opportunities. The Panel report explores this approach in some depth and, in principle, accepts it as reasonable on the basis of the arguments put forward.
- At the EiP, arguments were made by representatives of Gypsy and Traveller organisations that the redistribution might mean some Gypsies and Travellers would be forced to move because the allocation for a particular local authority is smaller than the number of families



currently in the area. They argued that there should be a minimum pitch allocation for all authorities in order to maximise choice, but that there should be no corresponding reduction in requirements elsewhere – in other words they argued that the regional pitch total should be increased. Contrary arguments were raised that some minimum ‘arbitrary’ allocations might not be taken up because Gypsies and Travellers would not want to live in the area, and that a particular local authority’s allocation should be reduced because of Green Belt or other constraints on the availability of suitable land for sites. The Panel did not accept either type of argument automatically, but in their report they painstakingly examine the allocation for each local authority to see whether it should be increased or decreased in the light of local circumstances. A significant minority of local authority allocations are amended in this way to take account of, for example, major housing developments which might provide the opportunity for site provision, small size and land availability constraints, and the level and concentration of existing provision. It is not clear whether this ‘bottom-up testing of the scale and distribution of pitch requirements’ is something that Regional Assemblies should themselves undertake.

- The pitch distribution figures in the policy relate to 2006–2011. Local authorities are likely to need indicative estimates of requirements over a much longer period for their local development framework. While a 3% p.a. growth rate can be used at regional level, a mechanism is needed at local level if there is to be continuous redistribution of requirements for strategic reasons. The Panel endorsed the policy that pitch requirements beyond 2011 should continue the redistributive principles established in 2006–2011, and recommended a clear statement of this and how estimates should be made at local level. The need to consider the longer term is a clear point arising from the EiP.
- Other points arising explicitly or implicitly demonstrate the importance of transparency in the processes followed by the Regional Assembly in reaching its Preferred Option and policy. This includes the importance of recording the alternative distribution Options examined and the reasons they were rejected. It also includes ensuring that the implications of sustainability appraisal of Options are similarly identified and incorporated into the process of moving towards the Preferred Option. In particular, very clear reasons should be given for preferring an Option which has more adverse points in the sustainability appraisal over one with fewer.

Thus the experience in the East of England endorses the central importance of benchmarked GTAAs as evidence of pitch requirements. The EiP supports the principle of making strategic local authority pitch allocations in line with the principle of spreading future provision to maximise choice and enhance delivery opportunities, but suggests that the principle should be tempered by an appreciation of what is reasonable on the ground. The longer-term implications of redistributive additional pitch allocations must be considered. The process of moving towards the Preferred Option should be transparent and consistent.

## South East England

The single issue review is not as far advanced in the South East as in either the South West or the East of England. In January 2009 the Regional Assembly's Regional Planning Committee received a report on the results of the public consultation on pitch numbers and distribution Options.<sup>15</sup> It approved a redistributive approach as the Preferred Option for residential pitch requirements 2006–2016 (as a single period). The Preferred Option is to be decided by the Regional Assembly at its meeting on 4 March 2009.

Because the approach adopted has not yet been tested through the EiP process, three points only are noted here:

- Most of the GTAA's in the South East were commissioned and often completed before the issue of Circular 04/2007 and thus did not fully include the requirements of Travelling Showpeople. Local authorities were urged to carry out further work to remedy this deficiency. Many worked with members of the Showmen's Guild of Great Britain to reach estimates of pitch requirements where the GTAA had not included such information. As a consequence there is complete coverage of the region for plot requirement estimates. The Preferred Option distribution of plots between local authorities is generated using the same approach as for residential pitches for Gypsies and Travellers.
- The Preferred Option involves a measure of strategic redistribution of pitches away from the 'need where it arises' estimates from the GTAA's and Advice from local authorities. An approach as followed in the East of England of making an arbitrary minimum allocation to all authorities was considered and rejected early in the deliberations. The Preferred Option has a somewhat similar effect in terms of widening the pitch distribution and increasing deliverability, but the methodology is different. A proportion of requirements are allocated according to two simple opportunities/constraints criteria: the local authority population at 2016 and its land area not designated as AONB, Green Belt, National Park, SSSI/SAC/SPA and flood risk zones 2 and 3. The Options consultation included both less and more redistributive Options and the Preferred Option was chosen as 'a deliverable compromise'.
- In the absence of hard quantitative information on requirements from GTAA's on transit pitches/sites, the current proposal is that determination of need and location of sites should be delegated to councils working in consultation with Gypsy and Traveller communities. This is different from and less directive than the approach taken in the South West and by the EiP Panel in the East of England. It remains to be seen whether such an approach proves acceptable at EiP in the South East.

---

<sup>15</sup> See [http://www.southeast-ra.gov.uk/documents/events/46/agenda\\_item\\_4-gtts\\_review\\_preferred\\_option.pdf](http://www.southeast-ra.gov.uk/documents/events/46/agenda_item_4-gtts_review_preferred_option.pdf).

## 9. References

CLG (2007) *Preparing Regional Spatial Strategy reviews on Gypsies and Travellers by regional planning bodies.*

Powell, R. (2006) *Identifying Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation Needs in Yorkshire and The Humber.* Centre for Regional and Economic Social Research: Sheffield Hallam University.

| Appendix Table A1: Requirements by Local Authority from the GTAA's |                     |                        |   |                     |                        |                       |            |
|--|---------------------|------------------------|---|---------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| Local authority  | GTAA period covered | Inclusive No. of years | Additional residential pitch requirements |                     | Transient requirements | Travelling Showpeople |            |
|  |                     |                        | Years 1–5                                 | Years 6–10          |                        | Years 1–5             | Years 6–10 |
| East Riding of Yorkshire   | 2008–2015           | 8                      | 32 (8 years)                              |                     | NA                     | 0                     | 0          |
| Hull   | 2006–2016           | 10                     | 36  | 17                  | 5 pitches              | 0                     | 0          |
| NE Lincolnshire  | 2007–2016           | 9                      | 10  | 3 (4 years)         | 10 pitches             | 0                     | 0          |
| North Lincolnshire   | 2007–2016           | 9                      | 34  | 8 (4 years)         |                        | 2                     | 2          |
| <b>The Humber</b>  | <b>NA</b>           | <b>NA</b>              | <b>140</b>                                |                     | <b>15</b>              | <b>2</b>              | <b>2</b>   |
| Craven   | 2007–2015           | 9                      | 7 (9 years)                               |                     | NA                     | NA                    | NA         |
| Hambleton  | 2007–2015           | 9                      | 51 (9 years)                              |                     | NA                     | NA                    | NA         |
| Harrogate  | 2007–2015           | 9                      | 9 (9 years)                               |                     | NA                     | NA                    | NA         |
| Richmondshire  | 2007–2015           | 9                      | –3 (9 years)                              |                     | NA                     | NA                    | NA         |
| Ryedale  | 2007–2015           | 9                      | 28 (9 years)                              |                     | NA                     | NA                    | NA         |
| Scarborough  | 2007–2015           | 9                      | 6 (9 years)                               |                     | NA                     | NA                    | NA         |
| Selby  | 2007–2015           | 9                      | 64 (9 years)                              |                     | NA                     | NA                    | NA         |
| York   | 2007–2015           | 9                      | 102 (9 years)                             |                     | NA                     | NA                    | NA         |
| <b>North Yorkshire</b>   | <b>NA</b>           | <b>NA</b>              | <b>265</b> (9 years)                      |                     | <b>NA</b>              | <b>NA</b>             | <b>NA</b>  |
| Barnsley   | 2006–2011           | 5                      | 48  | NA                  | NA                     | 8                     | NA         |
| Doncaster  | 2006–2011           | 5                      | 114                                       | NA                  | NA                     | NA                    | NA         |
| Rotherham  | 2006–2011           | 5                      | 16  | NA                  | NA                     | 8                     | NA         |
| Sheffield  | 2006–2011           | 5                      | 29  | NA                  | NA                     | 8                     | NA         |
| <b>South Yorkshire</b>   | <b>NA</b>           | <b>NA</b>              | <b>207</b>                                | <b>NA</b>           | <b>NA</b>              | <b>24</b>             | <b>NA</b>  |
| Bradford   | 2008–2015           | 8                      | 19  | 6 (3 years)         | 6                      | 6                     | 2          |
| Calderdale   | 2008–2015           | 8                      | 7   | 1 (3 years)         | 1                      | 6                     | 2          |
| Kirklees   | 2008–2015           | 8                      | 9   | 2 (3 years)         | 2                      | 6                     | 2          |
| Leeds  | 2008–2015           | 8                      | 40  | 8 (3 years)         | 6                      | 6                     | 2          |
| Wakefield  | 2008–2015           | 8                      | 26  | 6 (3 years)         | 5                      | 5                     | 3          |
| <b>West Yorkshire</b>  | <b>NA</b>           | <b>NA</b>              | <b>101</b>                                | <b>23</b> (3 years) | <b>20</b>              | <b>29</b>             | <b>11</b>  |

| Appendix Table A2: Requirements by Local Authority: GTAA's, further research and supplementary estimates |   |            |                        |                       |            |
|--|---|------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| Local authority  | Additional residential pitch requirements |            | Transient requirements | Travelling Showpeople |            |
|  | Years 1–5                                 | Years 6–10 |                        | Years 1–5             | Years 6–10 |
| East Riding of Yorkshire   | 32  | 0          | 5                      | 0                     | 0          |
| Hull   | 36  | 17         | 5                      | 0                     | 0          |
| North East Lincolnshire  | 10  | 3          | 10                     | 0                     | 0          |
| North Lincolnshire   | 34  | 10         |                        | 2                     | 2          |
| <b>Humber</b>  | <b>112</b>                                | <b>30</b>  | <b>20</b>              | <b>2</b>              | <b>2</b>   |
| Craven   | 7   | 0          | 2                      | NA                    | NA         |
| Hambleton  | 37  | 23         | 2                      | NA                    | NA         |
| Harrogate  | 11  | 0          | 2                      | NA                    | NA         |
| Richmondshire  | 0   | 0          | 2                      | NA                    | NA         |
| Ryedale  | 21  | 12         | 2                      | NA                    | NA         |
| Scarborough  | 5   | 2          | 2                      | NA                    | NA         |
| Selby  | 50  | 24         | 2                      | NA                    | NA         |
| York   | 77  | 41         | 2                      | NA                    | NA         |
| <b>North Yorkshire</b>   | <b>208</b>                                | <b>102</b> | <b>16</b>              | <b>NA</b>             | <b>NA</b>  |
| Barnsley   | 48  | 14         | 2                      | 8                     | NA         |
| Doncaster  | 114                                       | 56         | 2                      | 117                   | NA         |
| Rotherham  | 16  | 3          | 2                      | 8                     | NA         |
| Sheffield  | 29  | 10         | 2                      | 8                     | NA         |
| <b>South Yorkshire</b>   | <b>207</b>                                | <b>83</b>  | <b>8</b>               | <b>141</b>            | <b>NA</b>  |
| Bradford   | 19  | 12         | 6                      | 6                     | 2          |
| Calderdale   | 7   | 1          | 1                      | 6                     | 2          |
| Kirklees   | 9   | 3          | 2                      | 6                     | 2          |
| Leeds  | 40  | 12         | 6                      | 6                     | 2          |
| Wakefield  | 26  | 10         | 5                      | 5                     | 3          |
| <b>West Yorkshire</b>  | <b>101</b>                                | <b>38</b>  | <b>20</b>              | <b>29</b>             | <b>11</b>  |